UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,750	12/07/2001	Harold Kester	WEBSEN.034A	8849

20995   7590   06/02/2005

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/017,750	KESTER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mellissa M. Chojnacki	2164	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 March 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-103_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _1-54 and 98-103_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _55-97_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   In response to communications filed on March 11, 2005, claims 55, 76 and 97

are amended. Therefore, claims 1-103 are still presently pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 1-54 and 98-103 are allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4.   Claims 55-66, 72-77, 81-84, 90-91 and 94-96 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Shannon</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618).

As to claim 55, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches a method for processing and uploading

identifiers for updating a filtering system which controls access to Internet sites, the

method (See abstract; column 15, lines 38-63) comprising:

requesting a download of identifiers and their associated categories from a

database factory (See abstract; column 1, lines 12-26; column 15, lines 38-63);

determining whether a database of identifiers are to be uploaded to the database

factory (See abstract; column 15, lines 38-63), wherein the database of identifiers

includes at least one uncategorized identifier corresponding to a website/page

requested to be accessed by a user (See column 11, lines 11-41; lines 64-67; column

12, lines 1-9; column 15, lines 38-63);

if the database of identifiers are to be uploaded to the database factory, retrieving

identifiers from the database of identifiers (See abstract; column 4, lines 32-43; column

10, lines 7-23); and

uploading the database of identifiers to the database factory (See abstract;

column 3, lines 40-45; column 5, lines 51-67; column 6, lines 1-3; column 10, lines 7-23;

column 15, lines 38-63).

As to claim 56, <u>Shannon</u> wherein the database of identifiers includes an

uncategorized database of identifiers (See abstract; column 4, lines 38-43; column 11,

lines 11-15).

As to claim 57, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the database of identifiers includes a

master database of identifiers (See abstract; column 9, lines 15-24).

As to claim 58, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein the master database further includes

the master database request frequency (See abstract; column 15, lines 38-63).

As to claim 59, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches determining whether one or more indicators,

which relate to one or more categories, are associated with the uncategorized

identifiers; and referring to the one or more, indicators to prioritize the uncategorized

identifiers prior to uploading the uncategorized database of identifiers to the database

factory (See column 4, lines 6-26; column 8, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 16-18).

As to claim 60, <u>Shannon</u> teaches uploading additional data associated with the

uncategorized identifiers to the database factory (See abstract; column 10, lines 16-23;

column 11, lines 11-15; column 17, lines 38-40).

As to claim 61, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the additional data includes a request

frequency (See column 4, lines 27-31).

As to claim 62, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the uncategorized database further

includes additional data associated with the identifier (See abstract; column 4, lines 32-

43; column 10, lines 7-23; column 11, lines 11-40; column 17, lines 34-40).

As to claim 63, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the additional data includes a trace ID

(See column 15, lines 38-63).

As to claim 64, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the additional data includes a primary

language used by the filter system (See abstract; column 10, lines 46-51).

As to claim 65, <u>Shannon</u> teaches processing the uncategorized identifier and the additional data prior to uploading to the database factory (See abstract; column 4, lines 38-43; column 11, lines 11-15).

As to claim 66, <u>Shannon</u> teaches formatting the uncategorized identifiers and the additional data using a markup language (See abstract; column 10, lines 46-51); and limiting the size of an upload file, which includes the uncategorized identifiers and the additional data (See abstract; column 4, lines 38-43; column 11, lines 11-15).

As to claim 72, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein uploading the database of identifiers is periodic (See abstract; column 3, lines 60-67; column 4, lines 1-5; column 9, lines 25-43).

As to claim 73, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein uploading the database of identifiers is Random (See abstract; column 3, lines 60-67; column 4, lines 1-5; column 9, lines 25-43).

As to claim 74, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein uploading the database of identifiers is at a set time (See abstract; column 16, lines 13-14).

As to claim 75, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein uploading the database of identifiers is in response to polling by the database factory (See abstract; column 16, lines 13-14).

As to claim 76, <u>Shannon</u> teaches a method for processing identifiers for updating a filtering system which controls access to Internet sites (See abstract), the method comprising:

receiving identifiers at a database factory from a filter system (See abstract; column 1, lines 12-26; column 15, lines 38-63);

determining whether each of the identifiers has been previously categorized (See abstract; column 15, lines 38-63);

for each identifier that was not previously categorized by the database factory, categorizing each of the identifiers, a website/page associated with the identifier, and/or additional data associated with the identifier, and associating output with each identifier (See abstract; column 10, lines 7-23; column 15, lines 38-63); and posting the identifier along with the associated output into a database of categorized sites (See abstract; column 11, lines 16-40; column 15, lines 38-63; column 15, lines 38-63).

As to claim 77, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein the output includes one or more categories (See abstract; column 4, lines 38-43).

As to claim 81, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein the identifiers include an uncategorized identifier (See column 10, lines 16-23).

As to claim 82, <u>Shannon</u> teaches wherein the identifiers include a categorized identifier (See abstract; column 15, lines 38-63).

As to claim and 83, <u>Shannon</u> teaches receiving at the database factory a master database request frequency which indicates the frequency that the categorized identifier was requested at the filter system (See abstract; column 9, lines 25-43; column 15, lines 38-63).

As to claim 84, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches merging and sorting the identifier and a second identifier received from a second filter system (See abstract; column 13, lines 52-65).

As to claim 90, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches further comprising processing the identifiers and the additional data (See abstract; column 10, lines 7-23).

As to claim 91, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein processing includes reassembling the identifiers and the additional data using a markup language (See abstract; column 10, lines 46-51).

As to claim 94, <u>Shannon,</u> as modified, teaches wherein the identifier is a uniform resource locator (URL) (See <u>Shannon,</u> abstract, column 13, lines 11-19).

As to claim 95, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the identifier is an Internet Protocol

(I.P.) address (See <u>Shannon</u>, abstract; column 16, lines 51-52).

As to claim 96, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the identifier is a domain name (See

<u>Shannon</u>, abstract; column 10, lines 36-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 67-71, 78-79 and 92-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Shannon</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618), in view of <u>Omoigui</u> (U.S.

Patent Application No. 2003/0051026).

As to claim 67, <u>Shannon</u> does not teach encrypting the uncategorized identifiers

and the additional data; and compressing the uncategorized identifiers and the

additional data.

<u>Omoigui</u> teaches a system and method for knowledge retrieval, management,

delivery and presentation (See abstract), in which he teaches encrypting the

uncategorized identifiers and the additional data (See paragraph 0251; paragraph

0308); and

compressing the uncategorized identifiers and the additional data (See (See

paragraph 0251).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention was made to have modified Shannon, to include encrypting

the uncategorized identifiers and the additional data; and compressing the

uncategorized identifiers and the additional data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Shannon, by the teachings of Omoigui because

encrypting the uncategorized identifiers and the additional data; and compressing the

uncategorized identifiers and the additional data would provide a new and

comprehensive system and method of knowledge retrieval, management and delivery

(See Omoigui, paragraph 0070).

As to claims 68 and 93 Shannon as modified, teaches wherein encrypting is

performed using a data encryption standard (DES); wherein decrypting is performed

using a data encryption standard (DES) (See Omoigui, paragraph 0251).

As to claims 19, 38, 46, 69, 94 and 99 Shannon, as modified, teaches wherein

the uncategorized identifiers are uniform resource locators (URLs) (See Shannon,

abstract, column 13, lines 11-19).

As to claims 20, 39, 47, 70, 95 and 100 <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the uncategorized identifiers are Internet Protocol (I.P.) addresses (See <u>Shannon</u>, abstract; column 16, lines 51-52).

As to claims 21, 40, 48, 71, 96 and 101 <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the uncategorized identifiers are domain names (See <u>Shannon</u>, abstract; column 10, lines 36-40).

As to claim 78, <u>Shannon</u> as modified, teaches wherein the output includes a statistical probability (See <u>Omoigui</u>, abstract; paragraph 0499, paragraph 0530; paragraph 1228).

As to claim 79, <u>Shannon</u> as modified, teaches wherein the output includes a multidimensional vector (See <u>Omoigui</u>, abstract; paragraph 0290).

As to claim 92, <u>Shannon</u> as modified, teaches further comprising: decrypting the identifiers and the additional data; and decompressing the identifiers and the additional data (See <u>Omoigui,</u> abstract; paragraph 0251; paragrapgh 0308).

7.   Claim 80, 85-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Shannon</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618), in further view <u>Smith et al.</u> (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0019656).

As to claim 80, <u>Shannon</u> does not teach wherein categorizing each of the identifiers is performed by an automated classification engine.

<u>Smith et al.</u> teaches a system and method for monitoring global network activity (See abstract) in which he teaches wherein categorizing each of the identifiers is performed by an automated classification engine (See paragraph 009; paragraph 0055-0056).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Shannon</u>, to include wherein categorizing each of the identifiers is performed by an automated classification engine.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Shannon</u>, by the teachings of <u>Smith et al.</u> because wherein categorizing each of the identifiers is performed by an automated classification engine would help be a scalable capacity to track and record Internet content requests with the ability to authorize, in real time, web pages according their content and a subject's selected privileges (See <u>Smith et al.,</u> paragraph 006).

As to claim 85, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches further comprising determining whether processing of the output associated with the uncategorized identifier is performed (See column 10, lines 16 -23; column 11, lines 11-15).

As to claim 86, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the processing of the output includes automatically posts the uncategorized identifier to the master database (See <u>Shannon,</u> abstract; column 9, lines 15-24; column 10, lines 16 -23; column 11, lines 11-15).

As to claim 87, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein the processing of the output includes

verifying that the output associated with the uncategorized identifier is correct (See

<u>Shannon,</u> column 10, lines 16 -23; column 11, lines 11-15).

As to claim 88, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches wherein verifying is performed by human

review (See <u>Shannon,</u> abstract; column 16, lines 53-60).

As to claim 89, <u>Shannon</u>, teaches further comprising providing feedback from the

human review to the automated classification engine (See <u>Shannon,</u> abstract; column

16, lines 53-60).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed on March 22, 2004, with respect to the rejected

claims in view of the cited references have been considered but are moot in view of the

new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicants' arguments regarding claims 55 and 76, by amending

both claims to include "wherein at least one of the identifiers corresponds to an internet

site requested to be accessed by a user" overcome the prior art of record, the

arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because

<u>Shannon</u> discloses "receiving a request from a client" to access the internet, wherein a

access control database containing categorized identifiers is accessed (See column 15,

lines 38-63).

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571)

272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 25, 2005
Mmc

SAM RIMELL
EXAMINER